

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
CRAIG AMIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO,

Defendant.  
-----

MEMORANDUM

05-cv-543-bbc

In this court's June 30, 2006 order, I granted defendant Loyola University Chicago's motion to dismiss this case as a sanction for plaintiff Craig Amin's repeated refusal to comply with defendant's discovery requests. Since that time plaintiff has filed several other cases in this court, succeeding in none of them. Now plaintiff has submitted two letters in which he takes issue with this court's administration of his various actions. In particular, plaintiff asks the court when it will rule on his February 6, 2006 motion for partial summary judgment in the above-captioned case. It is impossible to believe plaintiff could be under the impression that this motion remains unresolved; I issued an order on March 31, 2006 denying that motion and reiterated the reasoning for that decision in two later orders, dated June 9, 2006, and June 30, 2006. This is the fourth time plaintiff has been notified his

motion for partial summary judgment was denied.

The other questions raised by plaintiff are similarly impertinent. He inquires about the status of case nos. 06-cv-421-bbc and 07-cv-702-bbc, but as plaintiff is surely aware, both of these cases have been closed for over a year. He asks such questions as whether the signatures I entered on the various orders in his cases were manually signed or were rendered by a machine, or whether this court schedules any other business while a trial takes place. These letters follow other correspondence in which plaintiff questioned whether the time stamp used by the clerk's office properly identified the current clerk of court. I will not respond to any of these irrelevant issues.

Plaintiff's filings continue a pattern of behavior I described in the June 30, 2006 order as "fixat[ing] on minor details of procedural rules to the exclusion of the larger goals of fairness" and "glorify[ing] form over substance in repeated manifestations of bad faith." This court cannot waste more time dealing with plaintiff's submissions. In an effort to avoid further waste of judicial resources, I am directing the clerk of court to route directly to chambers without docketing any further submissions other than new complaints petitioner files in this court. If the submission is not in the form of a proposed complaint, I will respond to it only if, in my view, it raises a matter requiring a response. Otherwise, it will

be placed in a miscellaneous file without comment.

Entered this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge